

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, 19-20, and 24-31 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 26, and 29 are amended herein. None of the amendments to any of the claims have been made to overcome any prior art. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 2 of the office action, the Examiner objected to claims 13 and 20 due to certain informalities. In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, 19-20, and 24-31 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In paragraph 6, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, 19-20, and 24-31 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete. In response to these claims objections and rejections, the Applicant has further amended the claims.

Claim 1 has been amended such that step (e) recites "decorrelating at least one signal derived from the digitised signal in a first finger of the rake receiver corresponding to a first signal path using the code sequence in the synchronizing branch to generate an intermediate signal for the first signal path corresponding to the first finger," while step (f) recites "subtracting, for the first signal path, the interference contribution of the at least one other finger from the intermediate signal to produce an interference reduced signal." Claims 26 and 29 have been similarly amended. The Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1, 26, and 29 overcome the rejections of those claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 5 and 13 have been amended to be consistent with the amendments to claim 1.


The Applicant submits further that the amendments to claim 1 and 26 make the objections to claims 13 and 20 moot.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite the step of "determining before step f) the real part of the intermediate signal, wherein the interference contribution is subtracted from the real part of the intermediate signal to produce the interference reduced signal." The Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 8 overcome the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Date: 5/22/06  
Customer No. 46900  
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.  
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Respectfully submitted,

  
Steve Mendelsohn  
Registration No. 35,951  
Attorney for Applicant  
(215) 557-6657 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)